UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,374	02/23/2004	Pal Takacsi-Nagy	ORACL-01389US2	8929

23910   7590   01/06/2009

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 CALIFORNIA STREET
14TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

EXAMINER
WANG, JUE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 October 2008*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 18-20* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 18-20* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-3, and 18-20 have been examined.

2.   Claims 4-14, 21-31 and 35-42 were cancelled in Amendment dated 6/9/2008. Claims 15-

17 and 32-34 were cancelled in Amendment dated 10/29/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leymann et

al. (US 6,308,224 B1, hereinafter Leymann).

5.   As per claim 1, Leymann teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for

extending a language, comprising the steps of:

        selecting a program source file including a workflow definition created using a workflow

language, wherein the program source file includes a source code and classes therein and a

workflow definition that is specified in the form of annotations to the source code and the classes

(see Fig 19, column 3, lines 16-26, column 8, lines 4-61, column 12, line 65 – column 13, line

45; EN: the workflow specification is considered as a program source file including a workflow

definition created using the workflow language FLOWMARK definition language, the workflow

specification includes classes since the workflow specification is linked to classes, and the

additional keywords are considered as the annotations), and wherein the workflow language

extends the source code with a plurality of workflow constructs, including an action construct

representing an activity that allows a first software component to call an operation on a second

software component (see column 7, lines 43-52, column 8, lines 4-51; EN: the PROGRAM

ACTIVITY keyword is considered as the action construct); and

using a workflow program according to the workflow definition, including processing,

using a computer including a processing device operating thereon, the action construct to allow

the first software component to call an operation on the second software component (see column

7, lines 43-52, column 8, lines 4-51).

6.   As per claim 18, the limitations recited in this system claim are substantially similar to

those recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected using the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 2, 3, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Leymann et al. (US 6,308,224 B1, hereinafter Leymann), in view of Meredith (US 6,516,322

B1).

9.   As per claim 2, Leymann does not teach the plurality of workflow definition constructs are provided as markup language commands that are then used as annotations to the source code and the classes.

Meredith teaches providing workflow definition constructs as markup language commands (see column 2, lines 13-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Leymann such that the workflow definition constructs used as annotations are provided as markup language commands as taught by Meredith because XML is a well known format for describing structured data (see column 1, lines 50-67 of Meredith).

10.   As per claim 3, Leymann does not teach the plurality of workflow definition constructs are provided as XML commands that are then used as annotations to the source code and the classes.

Meredith teaches providing workflow definition constructs as XML commands (see column 2, lines 13-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Leymann such that the workflow definition constructs used as annotations are provided as XML commands as taught by Meredith because XML is a well known format for describing structured data (see column 1, lines 50-67 of Meredith).

11.   As per claims 19 and 20, the limitations recited in this system claims are substantially

similar to those recited in claims 2 and 3. Therefore, it is rejected using the same reasons as

claims 2 and 3.

Response to Arguments

12.   Rejection of claims 1 and 18 under §103(a):

13.   As per independent claims 1 and 18, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered

but are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

- o   Altman (US 6,721,921 B1) is cited to teach a method for generating workflow messages

    based on adding annotations to a file repository.

- o   Rehof et al. (US 7,203,924 B2) is cited to teach behavioral analysis for message-passing

    application programs using type annotations.

- o   Bau, III et al. (US 2003/0023957 A1) is cited to teach annotation based development

    platform for stateful web services.

- o   Jain et al. (US 2006/0048093 A1) is cited to teach mapping software code to business

    logic using annotated source code.

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jue S. Wang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1655. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am - 5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./   Jue Wang
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193   Examiner
                                                                         Art Unit 2193